

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated January 2, 2008, claims 1-49 were rejected. Applicants are amending claim 1 in this Amendment and Response.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-4, 6, 12, 14, 29-32, 38 and 40 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of US Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama (hereinafter “Sugiyama”) and US Patent No. 5,987,226 to Ishikawa (hereinafter “Ishikawa”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A system for printing time-based media, the system comprising:
a media processing system for determining an electronic representation of the time-based media wherein the media processing system resides at least in part on a multimedia printer and at least in part on an external media processing system;
the multimedia printer including a housing for supporting an interface for transferring time-based media between the external media processing system and the printer, and for supporting an electronic output system in communication with the media processing system to receive the electronic representation, the electronic output system producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media;
a resource allocation module for receiving a request for at least one media processing task and determining processing allocation for at least one media processing

task among the printer and the external media processing system based on criteria;
a first interface for communicating with a first peripheral device;
a second interface for communicating with a second peripheral device;
a third interface for communicating with a third peripheral device.

Sugiyama is directed to a video printer and fails to disclose or suggest “a resource allocation module for receiving a request for at least one media processing task and determining processing allocation for at least one media processing task among the printer and the external media processing system based on criteria,” “a first interface for communicating with a first peripheral device,” “a second interface for communicating with a second peripheral device,” and “a third interface for communicating with a third peripheral device.” Sugiyama merely describes a video printer that received video data, processes it and prints out associated images of the processed video. No where in Sugiyama discloses or teaches resource allocation based on criteria or multiple peripheral interfaces for communicating with multiple peripheral devices. Therefore, Sugiyama also fails to disclose or suggest “a resource allocation module for receiving a request for at least one media processing task and determining processing allocation for at least one media processing task among the printer and the external media processing system based on criteria,” “a first interface for communicating with a first peripheral device,” “a second interface for communicating with a second peripheral device,” and “a third interface for communicating with a third peripheral device.”

Ishikawa fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama as Ishikawa also fails to disclose “a resource allocation module for receiving a request for at least one media

processing task and determining processing allocation for at least one media processing task among the printer and the external media processing system based on criteria,” “a first interface for communicating with a first peripheral device,” “a second interface for communicating with a second peripheral device,” and “a third interface for communicating with a third peripheral device.” Ishikawa merely describes a printing system and method including a “dumb” printer and parallel processors. No where in Ishikawa discloses or teaches resource allocation based on criteria or multiple peripheral interfaces for communicating with multiple peripheral devices. Therefore, Ishikawa also fails to disclose or suggest “a resource allocation module for receiving a request for at least one media processing task and determining processing allocation for at least one media processing task among the printer and the external media processing system based on criteria,” “a first interface for communicating with a first peripheral device,” “a second interface for communicating with a second peripheral device,” and “a third interface for communicating with a third peripheral device.”

Also, as claims 3-4, 6, 12, 14, 29-32, 38 and 40 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 also apply to claims 3-4, 6, 12, 14, 29-32, 38 and 40. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3-4, 6, 12, 14, 29-32, 38 and 40 are also patentable over Sugiyama and Ishikawa, both alone and in combination for at least the reasons recited above.

Based on the above amendment the remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 1, 3-4, 6, 12, 14, 29-32, 38 and 40 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claim 5 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Ishikawa and US Patent No. 6,167,033 to Chang (“Chang”). This rejection is traversed. Chang and Ishikawa do not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama. As stated above, Ishikawa merely describes a system for performing parallel processing of images. Chang merely describes a multi-party network communication system. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 7, 8, 15, 23, 33-34 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Ishikawa and US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220988 to Hymel (“Hymel”). This rejection is traversed. Ishikawa and Hymel do not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama. As stated above, Ishikawa merely describes a system for performing parallel processing of images. Hymel merely describes a method for establishing an interface for controlling an accessory device. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 7, 8, 15, 23, 33-34 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 9, 25, 26 and 35 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Ishikawa and US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010641 to Stevens (“Stevens”). This rejection is traversed. Stevens does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Ishikawa. Stevens merely describes a portable receiving system for receiving data products and data product information. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 9, 25, 26 and 35 are

patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 10 and 36 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stevens, Ishikawa, Hymel and McCarthy. This rejection is traversed. McCarthy does not remedy the deficiencies of Stevens, Ishikawa and Hymel. McCarthy merely describes a life cell for use in a disaster and a filtration system. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 10 and 36 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 18 and 44 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Kimura. This rejection is traversed. Kimura, does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Ishikawa. Kimura merely describes selecting between handling devices. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 18 and 44 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 19 and 45 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Kimura, Takemasa and Morinaga. This rejection is traversed. Kimura, Takemasa and Morinaga do not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Ishikawa. Kimura merely describes selecting between handling devices. Takemasa merely describes a feeder type handling mechanism. Morinaga merely describes a bandolier type handling mechanism. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these

reasons claims 19 and 45 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 20 and 46 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa and Steinberg. This rejection is traversed. Steinberg does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Ishikawa. Steinberg merely describes a disposable media writer. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 20-21 and 23 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-49, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peter E. Hart, Jonathan J. Hull, Jamey Graham
and Kurt W. Piersol

Date: May 30, 2008

By: /Kanda Ishihara/

Kanda Ishihara, Reg. No. 56,607
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650)-335-7805
Fax: (650) 938-5200